

## Jisc final report

### [OAGP Pathfinder Projects]

Project Information			
Project Title	E2EOA		
Jisc grant reference			
Start Date	01/06/2014	End Date	31/05/2016
Lead Institution	University of Glasgow		
Project Manager (lead institution)	Valerie McCutcheon	Contact email	valerie.mccutcheon@glasgow.ac.uk
Project Manager (Jisc)	Sarah Fahmy Angela Hilton	Contact email	Sarah.Fahmy@jisc.ac.uk Angela.hilton@jisc.ac.uk
Project SRO (Jisc)	Neil Jacobs	Contact email	Neil.jacobs@jisc.ac.uk
Partner Institutions	University of Southampton, Lancaster University, University of Kent		
Project Web URL			
Other social media			
Document Information			
Author(s)	Valerie McCutcheon		
Project Role(s)	Project Manager		
Date	3 <sup>rd</sup> August 2016		
Access	This report is for general dissemination		
Document History			
Version	Date	Comments	
1.0	10/08/16		

Project Summary	P2
Objectives	P3
Outputs	P3
Lessons Learned	P3
Impact	P4
Conclusions/Recommendations	P4
References	P4
Appendices	P5
Budget Report	P6

## Project summary

The overall aim of E2E was to reduce the burden of Open Access (OA) implementation by establishing improved methods for dealing with requirements and issues such as:

- Which metadata to store to satisfy funders, interested parties, and internal requirements.
- Practical solutions to integrate capture and report metadata with existing infrastructure.
- Methods for linking award information with outputs and outcomes.
- The need to integrate the OA requirements of the next REF into processes.
- The ramifications of limited engagement with OA and the potential for sanctions and reduced impact of the goals of OA policies.

There are multiple relevant metadata standards at varying degrees of maturity and Organisations use a variety of systems. Many do not have a robust method of recording open access activity. Spreadsheets are often used with the associated issues of inconsistencies and restricted access due to multiple users and non-integration with other core systems. Finance Information is typically held in Finance Systems with no key to link it to the relevant publication.

In cooperation with other stakeholders such as **CASRAI** and **related Jisc projects**, we actively contributed to development of standard metadata recording and reporting specification and facilitated better analysis of open access activity and reporting to funders. To this end, the project aims included provision of improved mechanisms to link award information to research outputs however further work is still required on this aspect.

The functionality was delivered via the **EPrints** platform. We worked with the wider community thus ensuring standardisation as far as possible with other platforms and facilitating the evolution of robustly tested generic requirements. We explored open access functionality delivery via the **Hydra** platform. This cross-platform comparative dimension, alongside cross-programme communication, helped ensure the development of sector-scale functionality.

We believe that communication is key and therefore several workshops were arranged and widely advertised to discuss issues, share solutions, and plan future work. Open Access is wide reaching and is intrinsically linked with global developments to support open data, impact narratives, and evidence of research efficiencies. Thus, any

recommendations in relation to wider open access activities such as dataset management, impact, and, other research outcomes were shared with relevant stakeholders and fed into other initiatives.

## Objectives

The key objectives for the E2E project were:

- To provide a standard metadata profile and functionality within EPrints to support the Funding Councils' Open Access mandate for the next REF, research funder, and internal requirements. This was widely discussed and shared with other HEIs and beneficial to the EPrints community and beyond.
- To establish reporting capability in EPrints to provide assurance about the processes involved in recording open access information.
- To apply the standard metadata profile to a further digital repository infrastructure, Hydra, and provide guidelines on its applicability.
- To provide workshops and fora where stakeholders could identify issues and potential solutions, to summarise these, share these as widely as possible using existing networks, and proactively encourage problem solution and information sharing.
- To identify issues associated with implementation of the new REF open access requirements and propose some solutions.
- To identify issues associated with engaging researchers with the open access agenda and propose some solutions.

## Outputs

See Appendix 1

## Lessons Learned

- Clear communication between stakeholders is very important. Once our project started with part-funding and approval from Jisc we started to get information that some of the tasks we had outlined might be delivered by Jisc. It took some time to see find out exactly what would be delivered and consequently what we should go ahead and deliver. This impacted on the delivery of our outputs as there was delay whilst we found out what projects such as RIOXX and the REF Plug-In would actually do.
- It is important to make clear to possible consumers of outputs that they do not need to use all of the output. For example when building our open access profile in EPrints there were several fields added at the request of some users. Other sites do not need these fields and can disable, hide or ignore them if they choose.

## Impact

### Immediate impact

The project did not change what we did to support open access but it allowed us to do this in a more expedient way by having a little extra funding and the impetus of the project framework.

We feel the wider community has been richly informed with regards to solutions for metadata for open access using our project as an example and also our contribution to the Jisc Monitor project commenting on possible fields and issues associated with these. In addition we have run several workshops and feedback has indicated that these really facilitated sharing of information about open access in a better way than ad hoc communications.

The University of Glasgow has a good reputation for taking the lead in research information initiatives and sharing information. Our project manager won the Association of Research Managers and Administrators Technology, Innovation and Application award 2015 and much of the nomination was based on the efforts made to share information and encourage efficiency in research administration.

### Future impact

We continue to work with peer sites on EPrints specific Open Access developments. E.g. work with a site in Germany to agree standard field content, screen layout and reporting. All work is shared with the EPrints community and wider. We feel strongly that the wider community must standardise terminology to facilitate sharing of information between stakeholders and we hope that in future more work will be done via CASRAI UK to agree standard, system agnostic, definitions for more open access terms.

We plan to revisit the issues we have encountered and summarised via our workshops, and also at ARMA Open Access Special Interest Groups and other fora to see what has been resolved and what contributed to resolving issues.

## Conclusions/Recommendations

Overall we feel it was a good thing to be part of the Pathfinder programme. We feel there was a lot more engagement with the community and we hope that this community spirit will be sustained.

We would encourage the community to continue to work together on standard definitions and sharing experience on open access metadata to avoid confusion and facilitate sharing of information.

We would encourage Jisc to liaise with stakeholders more when planning strands of work so that more efficient method of delivering, sharing and re-using work can be identified.

## References

<http://e2eoa.org/>

## Appendices

### Appendix 1 Outputs

Output	Brief Description
Project Blog <a href="http://e2eoa.org/">http://e2eoa.org/</a>	Story of our work together developing technical and process solutions for open access.
Workshop Report 'Open Access Issues and Potential Solutions' <a href="#">Workshop Report 'Open Access Issues and Potential Solutions'</a>	This workshop took place early in the project to facilitate initial sharing of issues and potential solutions. What were the issues in September 2014?
Case study 'Capturing and Reporting Open Access Metadata in EPrints' Some details of the case study are contained in the pages of the blog <a href="http://e2eoa.org/">http://e2eoa.org/</a> .  A formal article was published March 2016:  McCutcheon, V and Eadie, M, Managing open access with EPrints software: a case study, <i>Insights</i> , 2016, 29(1), 45–52; DOI: <a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.1629/uksg.277">http://dx.doi.org/10.1629/uksg.277</a>	How we have managed open access using EPrints
Case study 'Capturing and Reporting Open Access Metadata in Hydra'  Some details of the case study are contained in the pages of the blog <a href="http://e2eoa.org/">http://e2eoa.org/</a>  The formal case study is at:  <a href="http://e2eoa.org/2016/08/08/mapping-open-access-requirements-to-pure-and-fedora-a-technical-case-study/">http://e2eoa.org/2016/08/08/mapping-open-access-requirements-to-pure-and-fedora-a-technical-case-study/</a>	This case study describes the applicability of the metadata profile in Hydra, providing a basis for interoperability with other similar systems.
Workshop Report 'Embedding future REF requirements' <a href="http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/104395/">http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/104395/</a>  An additional workshop that was not part of the formal deliverables took place looking at technical issues <a href="http://e2eoa.org/2016/04/29/open-access-technical-workshop-un-report/">http://e2eoa.org/2016/04/29/open-access-technical-workshop-un-report/</a>	Utilising close links with Funding Councils' we explored the expected reporting and exemption requirements and how these can be embedded into existing systems.

## [OAGP Pathfinder Projects]

<p>Workshop Report 'Open Access and the REF'</p> <p><a href="http://eprints.soton.ac.uk/385109/">http://eprints.soton.ac.uk/385109/</a></p> <p>Great summary by one of the attendees. Barry Hall, Sunderland is available at:</p> <p><a href="https://oapathfinder.wordpress.com/2015/09/15/open-access-and-the-research-excellence-framework-workshop/">https://oapathfinder.wordpress.com/2015/09/15/open-access-and-the-research-excellence-framework-workshop/</a></p>	<p>A further Open Access for REF workshop took place 10th September due to demand.</p>
<p>Standard EPrints 'RCUK' open access reporting mechanism. Further discussion on-going with community and Jisc Monitor project. Please contact <a href="mailto:research-openaccess@glasgow.ac.uk">research-openaccess@glasgow.ac.uk</a> for latest information and code. Code at <a href="https://github.com/eprintsug/OpenAccess">https://github.com/eprintsug/OpenAccess</a></p>	<p>Glasgow successfully tested and shared a standard EPrints report for reporting to RCUK. Work is on-going on testing the API recently made available for Monitor UK based on the same field content.</p>
<p>Improved EPrints functionality to link awards to outputs</p> <p><a href="https://github.com/eprintsug/gu-funder-fields">https://github.com/eprintsug/gu-funder-fields</a></p>	<p>Code made available to the community. Further discussion will take place in EPrints community. This output was delayed as RIOXX and REF plug-ins for EPrints were delivered later than expected and we needed more time to understand what these might deliver.</p>
<p>Summary of Technical Workshop.</p> <p><a href="http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/119076/">http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/119076/</a></p>	<p>Technical solutions in a number of different software applications and work in progress to address open access requirements were shared</p>

## Budget report

	Glasgow	Kent	Lancaster	Southampton	Total
Staff	£7,436.50	£7,000.00	£2,700.00	£5,722.51	<b>£22,859.01</b>
Travel	£4,691.03	£1,000.00	£3,758.80	£971.24	<b>£10,421.07</b>
Workshops	£3,641.00	£0.00	£274.70	£1,180.05	<b>£5,095.75</b>
Consumables	£231.47	£0.00	£1,266.50	£126.20	<b>£1,624.17</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>£16,000.00</b>	<b>£8,000.00</b>	<b>£8,000.00</b>	<b>£8,000.00</b>	<b>£40,000.00</b>

Staff costs to either perform basic administration or open access or backfill for staff working on the project.

Travel included attendance at many programme events and fellow pathfinder events.

Workshop costs generally cover the catering costs of the 5 workshops we delivered.

Consumables costs included leaflets and web hosting.